

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

A new title of the invention has been provided as required.

The claim objections have been overcome by insertion of the word "the".

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome by cancelling redundant Claim 36 and amending Claims 57-61.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the manner in which the recited invention distinguishes patentably from Kraus (4,558,494). The device of the invention comprises a sleeve having substantially identical ends that are exposed, so that the sleeve can be inserted in a bore without regard to which end is inserted first.

The Kraus device is designed for use in mounting fuel lines, for example, to threaded studs in motor vehicles. Hence, the fastening section 4 has one end designed for receiving a bolt or stud, but the other end is integral with a lip seal 11 and mounting devices 2 and 3 for acceptance of pipe lines.

Clearly, the device of Kraus is incapable of performing the intended function of Applicant's device. The cylinder 10 of Kraus is not constructed to be inserted into a bore and held therein by engagement of its outer surface with an inner surface of the bore and is not constructed with substantially identical ends that are exposed for insertion

in a bore, as required by Claim 1.

Independent Claim 2 recites that the fins have longitudinal ends that face longitudinal ends of the sleeve, respectively, and at least one longitudinal end of the fins extends away from the respective longitudinal end of the sleeve and away from the inner surface of the sleeve. No such structure is found in Kraus.

In Kraus, the cylinder 10 preferably has, at the inlet zone to interior space 5, a tapered or conically shaped entry zone 13. This characterizes the internal construction of the cylinder 10 and has nothing whatever to do with the longitudinal ends of the fins. As evident from Fig 4, for example, of Kraus, the ends of the fins are not tapered. Contrary to the assertions in the rejection, Fig. 1 of Kraus does not show fins that extend the length of the sleeve and that include at least one end having a conical or tapered shape, and each fin of Kraus does not have trapezoidal longitudinal side surfaces, as required by Claim 3 and others.

Independent Claim 12 recites that each fin is tapered by having at least one longitudinal end that extends away from a respective longitudinal end of the sleeve and away from the inner surface of the sleeve. Dependent Claim 13 recites that each fin has trapezoidal longitudinal side surfaces. Nothing of the sort is taught by Kraus.

Independent Claim 23 recites that each longitudinal end of the fins extends away from the respective longitudinal end of the sleeve and away from the inner surface of the

sleeve, and that each fin has trapezoidal longitudinal side surfaces, features not taught by Kraus. The amendment of Claim 23 was not required by the prior art rejections.

Independent Claim 29 has been amended in the manner of Claim 1 and clearly distinguishes patentably from Kraus, as discussed with regard to Claim 1.

Similarly, independent Claim 40 has been amended in the manner of Claim 1 and distinguishes patentably from Kraus as discussed with regard to Claim 1. Dependent Claim 41 recites that the fins have longitudinal ends that face longitudinal ends of the sleeve, respectively, and at least one longitudinal end of the fins extends away from the respective longitudinal end of the sleeve and away from the inner surface of the sleeve. Dependent Claim 42 recites that each fin has trapezoidal longitudinal side surfaces. These recitations clearly distinguish patentably from Kraus.

Independent Claim 51 has been amended in the manner of Claim 1 and distinguishes patentably from Kraus as discussed with regard to Claim 1.

Each of the independent claims and claims dependent thereon distinguish patentably from Kraus. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) proposes to cure deficiencies of Kraus by incorporating teachings from Szczukowski (6,280,132). There is no reasonable basis for the proposed combination of teachings.

The device of Kraus is not inserted in a bore. The devices of Szczukowski are designed for insertion in a bore and include multiple parts, none of which has internal fins.

The rejection misconstrues the paragraph bridging columns 2-3 of Kraus. That paragraph asserts that the Kraus invention is not limited to use in fastening elements for pipe lines in the motor vehicle industry but could be applied to other plastic components as for example mounting supports, spacers, or adjusting devices. Such components would be mounted on the cylinder 10, but there is no suggestion whatsoever in Kraus of inserting the cylinder 10 in a bore. There is no reasonable basis for modifying the cylinders and fins of Kraus to incorporate any teachings from Szczukowski.

More particularly, Claim 8 recites that end portions of the sleeve adjacent to the longitudinal ends of the sleeve, respectively, have an outer diameter that increases away from the respective longitudinal ends of the sleeve. Since the cylinders of Kraus are not intended to be inserted in a bore, there is no basis for modifying those cylinders in view of Szczukowski to meet the recitations of Claim 8. The same statements apply to Claims 19, 26, and 47. Claim 31 recites that each fin has trapezoidal longitudinal side surfaces. Nothing in Kraus or Szczukowski teaches this feature of Applicant's invention.

Dependent Claim 62 has been added to emphasize the bi-directional aspect of Applicant's invention.

This application is now believed to be clearly in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit

any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been requested separately, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NHS:lmb

Miles & Stockbridge P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 903-9000

March 30, 2005

By: Nelson H. Shapiro
Nelson H. Shapiro
Reg. No. 17,095